The Intermicronational Association: An introduction.

A brief explanation of the rationale behind the creation of the IA and an explanation of its internal structures and function, by Mark Kavanah.

The Intermicronational Association is a new intermicronational organisation being created to further the Intermicronational Community and to benefit participating micronations from across all communities. 'Why have we created a YAMO?', you might ask. 'What makes this any different to the GUM?' Or, you might ask, 'how does this work?' Or, hopefully, 'How does my micronation join?'

Find out the answers to these questions in the below guide, which has been written to provide a concise, albeit somewhat shortened, explanation of the rationale behind the IA's creation, and a brief explanation of its internal function. Although I have been given permission to create this guide by the IA's founders, this is not an official publication, and the organisation does not yet have a formal launch date.

Section 1: Why is the Intermicronational Association being created?

Is the Intermicronational Community dying?

"The Intermicronational Community is dying," Tom McMillan, the Glastieven Minister for Online and Diplomatic Affairs, said to a meeting of the Cabinet of Glastieve, in early October 2017. Nobody disagreed with him. Sat around that table were Robert Catcheside and Michael Howe, both members of the Intermicronational Community (IC)'s Facebook and Skype chatrooms, and Mark Kavanah, who first conceived the concept of the IC and worked to establish it. It has become an accepted fact in Glastieve, the first nation to publicly denounce MicroWiki and the home of two of the IC's founders, that the Intermicronational Community has, on some fundamental level, failed to achieve its goal.

Stepping backwards from this rainy Wednesday afternoon in Glastieve, however, it's obviously an exercise in hyperbole to state that the IC is 'dying,' in the sense that it's likely to soon go away. The Monarchist Republic, the seminal and perhaps rather infamous founding chatroom of the community, persists with short bursts of high activity. Technically, it has 25 participants, but since 1 October, only 8 participants (Emiel Hardy, Jordan Brizendine, Deniz, Nikola Jovanovic, me, Tom McMillan, Kit McCarthy (once) and Dylan Callahan) have posted.

The IC also has a Facebook group, simply called 'Intermicronational Community,' which has 13 participants (me, Michael Howe, Robert Catcheside, Tom McMillan, Carlo Massaca, Casey Pemberton, Christian Newton, Dylan Callahan, Lopes I, Jordan Brizendine, Joseph Marx, Oscar von Goetzen and William Peters). Although the Facebook group is less active than The Monarchist Republic, where it does break into conversation, it has a much better record for including everyone listed as a member in the discussion.

There is also a reasonable case for counting the Corian Lounge as a key chatroom of the IC. It is extremely active, more so than MicroWiki rooms like The Ragged Flagon were, and unlike rooms like the 'Glastieve lounge' is essentially open to any micronationalist. It has 16 participants, all of whom are also in The Monarchist Republic, with the exception of Ned Greiner, who can be treated as a special case (originally involved with the earliest attempt to create the IC before it became politically linked to the slightly later Austenesia-Devlvera diplomatic incident, Greiner changed his mind and returned to MicroWiki, but remains personal friends with several members of the IC and exists on the fringes of the MWC.)

Ignoring McCarthy, who claimed to only be in The Monarchist Republic as an observer and who was only posting 'as a member of MicroWiki,' and Greiner, who has steadfastly refused to engage with the IC at any point, this leaves us with a headcount of approximately 20.

Clearly, the Intermicronational Community is not 'dying' in any immediate sense, right? But what made a well-informed minister from a founding member of the IC who specialises in online affairs and foreign relations make that comment to a government meeting and see the room agree with his statement.

It's impossible to create a consistent definition for the term 'micronational community.'

The science of micronational relations should be a pragmatic and forefront aspect of any micronation's government. To clarify, this white paper on the Intermicronational Association is not an attempt to summarise the field, although I will attempt to explain any concepts that are particularly crucial to understanding the rationale behind the formation of the organisation. If you find yourself feeling as though something is a gross oversimplification or as though key ideas have been missed out, you're probably correct.

In Glastieve, at a Cabinet meeting, the economics minister would explain their methods and intentions, the infrastructure minister would excitedly talk about their latest small monument, the constitutional affairs minister would stand up and embarrass everyone by pointing out the week's list of contradictions between the law and official statements, and then foreign affairs would be ignored. It was taken as understood that Glastieve's interaction with 'the community,' a seemingly abstract entity, went on in parallel to the domestic function of the government.

Speaking tentatively, the same appears to be true across micronationalism. Some MicroWiki micronations like Nedland and Abelden exist at one extreme, almost operating a "physical" and an "online" country as separate entities, linked officially by a constitution and practically by a single community micronationalist. The waters were muddied further in MicroWiki thanks to the existence of a class of ambitious, intermicronationally-focussed diplomats/politicians who used institutions like the GUM to control the community as though it were a political entity, but that's a discussion for another white paper.

At the other end of the spectrum, there are micronations like Delvera, who try as hard as possible to avoid this strange situation through an insistence on bilateral relations and who are unlikely to simply source citizens from the community. However, the dichotomy between 'a focus on the community' and 'a focus on the nation' still exists, with a more effective internal government focused on governing the country seemingly correlated with a decrease in international activity.

Untangling the difference between how macronations and micronations conduct diplomacy inevitably leads to the question of defining what is actually meant by the micronational community. In the MWC, the prevailing view appears to be to define

the community as being a group of nations. The article ‘MicroWiki Community’ states that the term is ‘used to describe a group of micronations who have formed an independent, largely self-contained micronational community on MicroWiki by using the Wiki, its forums and various Skype chatrooms as their primary platform for diplomatic contact and sharing information.’

In the IC, the more popular view has recently been to describe the community as a collection of micronationalists, and to deal separately with the idea of the relations between micronations. In essence, the community is seen as a loosely-defined complex of micronationalists from different micronations sharing ideas and making friends, whereas micronational relations are seen as taking place on a related but separate plane.

Within Glastieve, the example with which I am most familiar, there is something of a tendency to define the community as fulfilling the role of a third-party chorus entity against which the success of a micronation can be judged. The concept of ‘informal diplomacy,’ an idea incorporated under the wider euphemism of ‘communications,’ refers to the social capital built up through participation in the community, which has an inevitable effect on the ability of the nation to form formal relations. A role something like that of the press or the public is attributed to the community, with the government’s image in the community manipulated and controlled in the same way that a macronational government like the UK’s would attempt to influence how newspapers report on them.

Micronational organisations make the issue even more confusing. Although the MWC claims that nations, not people, make up its membership, it also refers to the platforms for individual interaction as ‘the community,’ with the term used as a collective noun for platforms like the forums, the wiki and the Skype lounges, which have individual micronationalists, often talking casually, as their members, not nations. Does this mean that the IC’s semi-official definition is simply more in line with the vernacular than MicroWiki’s? Possibly, but then organisations like the Grand Unified Micronational are referred to as a ‘part’ of the community as well.

The IC’s initial resolution of the contradiction can be inelegantly expressed through the words of Ned Greiner, who once said, ‘you are never dealing with the micronation itself. You are always dealing with the autistic, often self-loathing dorko behind the micronation.’ Later, especially as Delvera became involved, the IC shifted towards defining the community purely as the interaction between

micronationalists, and as having no real relevance to micronational politics aside from a possibly undesirable influence on diplomacy.

The contradiction seen in the MWC's understanding of itself might actually lend credence to the Glastieven view, that 'the community' is an abstract entity that consists of the interactions between the representatives of nations, usually acting either in their own or in their micronation's interest. As exciting as this is when attempting to construct a political narrative, it too fails to reflect the practical structure of the community, which is much more focussed on casual conversation between individuals, including but by no means limited to commentary on the behaviour of governments and micronational political conversation.

So what is 'the micronational community'? It's impossible to say. However, it is possible to make a useful distinction between four main types of interaction that drive the community: communication between nations (not people); casual conversation; political and self-interested interaction akin to what could be macronationally described as 'the politico-journalistic grapevine;' and meaningful and helpful discussion between individuals on how to further their micronations and make progress. The IC acknowledges the last three but excludes the first as 'diplomacy,' which is separate. The MWC is unclear, but seems to include all four. Glastieve includes only the latter two, with a confusing grey area as to where diplomacy becomes Machiavellian or backdoor enough to be seen as a part of the community.

The IC is nothing but a collective term for increasingly separate clusters of social connections.

The original forum post on the MW forums that announced the creation of the IC, which I note with some amusement has been deleted by the administrators of MW, lashed out at a fundamentally broken structure. I've printed a copy of the document, which was less than two pages long, below -

> ### *Introduction: it's time for a change*
>
> *Everyone in the micronations.wiki community, apart from the very newest members, understands the class system that we all have a rank in.*

At the top, there are the 'old guard' and the 'community leaders', who determine whether or not projects will succeed or fail and whether or not people will be 'popular' or 'unpopular', setting the general direction for the community. If you have an exciting new project, you either have to complete it by yourself and make a very impressive launch, or more often than not, you will need to have a member of this upper tier support you, if you want to have any chance of your project making it off the ground. In a broad sense, this is why every 'micronational UN' project fails, yet the Grand Unified Micronational (GUM) was revived after a complete collapse and still managed to have itself taken seriously and become a respected institution.

Below the upper tier, there is a middle tier that makes up the vast majority of the community. This is composed of a mixture of very ambitious and not-so-ambitious people who are often the sole representative for their micronation in the community and who desperately want to make a name for themselves or their micronation. YAMOs, news organisations, empires and other things will constantly be created as people here essentially fight for recognition from the top tier, who sometimes give out titles like 'Member of Parliament' or 'Minister for Culture". Some people at any given time will be 'in favour' and some will be 'out of favour' with the upper tier, and this will greatly influence their power to do anything with their micronation.

Below this, there are people who have been 'drummed out of the magic circle' by the upper tier and who are disillusioned with the community, and will often be found trying to persuade people to withdraw from the GUM or complaining in private messenger about the class system that has dumped them at the bottom. A good number of them walk away to the Micras or Facebook communities, quite often to a collective shout of 'good riddance' from the nastier members of the upper tier.

There are also newbies and the 'forum community', who exist pretty much separately. If it still functions in the way it did when we moved into the community, they are forced to 'prove themselves' on the forums before a kind-hearted middle-tier or upper-tier person gives them a link to a Skype chatroom and they are 'initiated' into the community as a newbie, soon to become a new member. In the current community there is alot of hate so we plan to create a new one that

We could talk at length about how this structure has evolved, about the way that it sustains itself through institutions like the Grand Unified Micronational (GUM) and about how it slowly drains the will to micronation from people who feel trapped at a certain layer. One of the top tier don't like you? Tough. Drummed out of the magic circle and stuck half-in, half-out? Tough. This community has generated a triangle, not a circle,

and it's slowly taking the fun out of micronationalism for many people who have felt too many of their ideologies be mocked, too many of their countries be called ridiculous and too many times have they been told to 'wait until you've made a name for yourself.'

The New Community Order (NCO)

The NCO is a project to change the way that the micronational community is run - to create a new micronations.wiki community based on equality and fun, because fundamentally, that's why we are all here.

In short, we are leaving the current micronations.wiki community to create a new one - and we want you to come with us!

This is not an attempt to criticise any individuals. We just think it's about time that we started over and created a new, fairer community where we can all work on our economies, diplomacy and countries without having to deal with the ambitious community structure that holds back the current micronations.wiki community.

If you want to join our new community, please make your interest known, and we'll add you to our (first) chatroom - 'The Monarchist Republic' (similar to The Ragged Flagon or the YBM)

This is a short document, and we might not sound like we have a lot to go on. But we're confident that you know what we mean.

This is a chance to leave the old ways and join a new community founded on fairness, and to do it with your head held high. Join us!

The rhetoric and ideology expressed in that document is fraught with issues and frankly I'm quite embarrassed to put my name to it. My later, more reasoned and explained, arguments against the MicroWiki Community would eventually trigger a change, but until that point, the members of the New Community (NC; what would become the IC) had done little more than grab their things and announce that they were leaving.

The NC was never really independent of the MWC, and all it served to do, practically, would be to formalise the community of people who had been 'drummed out of the magic circle,' in the words of the document, into something

defining itself as an alternative to the MWC. Around a month later, we attracted the attention of Delvera, the NAC and Karthia-Ruthenia, and the IC was born out of a dispute that would see us crash out of MicroWiki.

In some ways, this was a disaster. If the discussions had remained calm, there may have been a way to create a peaceful transitional arrangement that would guarantee the two communities' mutual recognition of each other and a free and peaceful opportunity for people (or nations?) to move from one to the other, or to express a wish to be members of both. This probably could not have happened for three key reasons -

1. Jonathan Austen was (and is) impossible to work with. He would have refused to treat the IC as an equal negotiating partner; his obsession with associating it with Glastieve and refusing to acknowledge Delvera, the NAC and Karthia-Ruthenia's roles is an indication of his arrogance in assuming the concept would never gain any traction.

2. The IC had no leadership, by its nature, and no structure that might have afforded it the capacity to negotiate. Although someone like me or Callahan could have agreed an arrangement with MicroWiki as an individual in order to benefit the community, neither wanted to risk appearing as a leader when the IC's claims were already being laughed at.

3. There would have been minimal short-term benefit to the MWC. The issue had gained little attention and Jonathan would not conceive of the idea of it benefitting the MWC in the long term to secure a deal, and as there was no detriment to them casting us out, those favoured by the status quo naturally chose to retain it.

Of course, then, these 'negotiations' just did not happen, and the IC and its members came crashing out of MicroWiki. Moderate members, many of whom remain in The Monarchist Republic to 'observe' or just because they've not been removed, were horrified, and retreated to the main MWC. Nations like Glastieve and Delvera cut ties with the MWC, and I personally left Abelden, which to me was a symbolic end of being 'on the edge' and being part of an entirely self-sustained community.

For a while, the community thrived on angry pride. The now inactive Memberry became rather infamous for his slogan 'Jonathan, we will dance on your grave,' and

a certain Minecraft server was created in which a ‘GUM prison’ was built for all the community leaders. However, as time went on, the IC stopped defining itself in opposition to MicroWiki, and in fact stopped defining itself at all. The present period of division and semi-activity looks like death to Tom McMillan because the community does nothing to be seen in Glastieve. The IC is nothing but a collective term for increasingly separate clusters of social connections.

Present attitudes to the nature of the community, particularly those that focus on it as separate to micronational diplomacy, are stifling the dream of a thriving and bustling community that we imagined when we set out to create a place for serious micronationalists to convene. What we have at the moment is undoubtedly a problem, for reasons I’ll explain to anyone who pretends there’s not one. What makes us different to the MWC? Does having a contradictory blend of concepts as your ethos and a rigid class system focussed on perpetuating itself even as people come and go make you a good community? Or is there something else?

The difficulty with attempting to establish a centre for a community founded on interpersonal, and not diplomatic, relations.

Before we talk about the solutions, there are some more problems that need to be highlighted in the present IC’s way of function.

One of these problems can be recognised without needing to address the politically difficult grey area between the micronational diplomacy that might make up the community and the interpersonal relations that definitely do. Firstly, there is a significant issue of division in the IC between two groups of members we can designate ‘classes.’

Firstly, it’s important to address the difference in activity between the Corian Lounge and The Monarchist Republic: almost every night without fail, there are between ten and one thousand messages sent in the Corian Lounge, whereas The Monarchist Republic’s short bursts of activity are memorable and nearly always include myself. Of the Corian Lounge’s participants, only a single person is also a member of the Facebook group (me, as it happens). Of the people active in The Monarchist Republic, only four (me, Tom McMillan, Dylan Callahan and Jordan Brizendine) are also a member of the Facebook group. All three of us ‘bridge’ members are either Glastieven or Delveran.

In the Facebook chat, which is much less active but usually features more respectful, serious discussion, citizens are identified by nation. For example, my name is “Mark Kavanah (Glastieve).” From this, we can see that there are two citizens of Karthia-Ruthenia, two of the NAC, four of Delvera, four of Glastieve, and one each from Nossia and Lifrea.

Does this hint at a class structure evolving in the IC? Not necessarily. It’s easy to claim that this is a result of a dichotomy between serious and non-serious micronationalists, which five minutes in the Facebook chat and then five in the Corian Lounge might convince you of, but this seems like a generally unfair and sweeping comment. It is actually symptom of a deeper issue: that the idea of a community not, on some level, founded by interaction between nations is a fallacy.

Where Delvera made a division between the ‘community’ and ‘diplomatic’ planes, we have already been able to make a meaningful distinction between four types of interactions (formalised communication between nations (not people); casual conversation; political and self-interested interaction akin to what could be macronationally described as ‘the politico-journalistic grapevine;’ and meaningful and helpful discussion between individuals on how to further their micronations and make progress).

The Monarchist Republic provides an element of the latter, but mostly sees casual conversation. The Corian Lounge, the most active, is almost entirely memes. The IC’s Facebook chat, where the dichotomy between ‘working on the community’ and ‘working on the government’ is taken as understood, is the most formalised of the three. Interestingly, for a chatroom which seeks to function purely on an interpersonal plane, people are introduced as being from micronations.

Now, we come to the heart of the problem. Serious micronationalists like being identified by nation. ‘Political and self-interested interaction akin to what could be macronationally described as ‘the politico-journalistic grapevine’ is common in micronationalism because micronationalists enjoy that method of conflict resolution. The Corian Lounge is more active than The Monarchist Republic partially by virtue of its attachment to a well-known nation (although also somewhat due to the presence of Ned Greiner), and even in the Facebook chat, micronationalists are identified by nation.

This is where I need to word myself carefully. I do not, under any circumstances, believe a return to the messy concept of the ‘MicroWiki sector’ is preferable or

desirable. I also do not believe that it is a coincidence that nations like Delvera and Glastieve, who draw the sharpest distinction between their diplomatic officers and internal government, are often the most successful at appearing influential in the community, despite being less active. However, it is impossible to ignore the reality of the situation: that serious micronationalists work on behalf of their nation and only engage in meaningful discussion beyond casual chatter when, on some level, representative of a government (or organisation.)

It is here that the IC's model of separating interpersonal and international relations into "the community" and "diplomacy" offers us some salvation. If we assume that, rationally, it's acceptable to determine that a community requires a 'center,' the evidence suggests that this must be somehow connected to micronations themselves: the IC thrived when governments had broken free from MicroWiki, and the MWC thrives through its wiki and forums. However, this sharp distinction can be maintained through a solution that the IA offers: a meaningful micronational organisation that provides a diplomatic center around which to build a community somewhere between the Glastieven definition and a more active equivalent to the present-day IC. It provides an opportunity to meaningfully define ourselves in more than just opposition to the MWC - and also a chance to attract new nations and micronationalists to the IA and the IC.

The advantages of the Intermicronational Association as a solution to the IC's issues and as an entirely new opportunity

An intergovernmental or supranational intermicronational organisation with defined powers that allow it to carry out its decisions is a dangerous weapon in the hands of the wrong individual, but a powerful opportunity to provide structured diplomacy, developed economic markets and consistent standards in areas of intermicronational contact. The IA is, as the coming sections will explain in depth, carefully structured to make it impossible for it to be taken over by self-interested individuals or used against member states. However, its creators have not shied away from affording it the power to carry out its decisions: joining the IA represents, often for the first time in a micronation's life, the giving up of some sovereignty to a powerful bloc. This is, in this circumstance, desirable.

In the *Resolution on Micronational Sovereignty*, a document of which I am a great fan, it states that "micronational laws are enforced through the implementation of punishments agreed to via consensus ad idem." This, in essence, explains in a

nutshell the IA's fundamental method of enforcing its decisions. Although the procedural details, found later in this guide, are important, the seminal principle remains that a micronation that chooses to reject the democratic wishes of the IA will have its participation limited: a refusal to lose sovereignty in order to integrate is a refusal to integrate. Imagine a triangle, with three vertices: democracy, absolute sovereignty, and beneficial integration. At any one time a member state may select only one side of this triangle, and the IA refuses to compromise on being democratic.

I am aware that the concept of an intermicronational organisation, even as a logical solution to the community's problems, is likely to go down like a lead balloon. The same micronationalists who understand a dichotomy between community participation and an internal focus are likely to reject the idea that there is any problem that requires solving at all (although I would quietly suggest that, as inactive members themselves, it would be unwise of them politically to admit to such an issue), and others are likely to be mistrustful of the IA in principle. However, there are logical benefits to having an intermicronational organisation that has the power to, diplomatically at least, effect its decisions.

To illustrate this, I would like to give three examples of areas where the IA would be able to have a positive impact: dispute resolution, economic and trading standards, and unified statements. These should be read as examples, and as an example of the general formula for ascertaining how useful the IA is in a particular field.

Dispute resolution is the most obvious use for a supranational body part of a larger intermicronational organisation. Even the famously insipid Grand Unified Micronational (GUM) managed to have a Supreme Court, although this was mostly academic, as it did not have the power to enforce its decisions. The IA would have much stronger teeth than the GUM in this area.

For example (this example will use terminology explained later), let's imagine that the Collaborative Assembly approved the creation of a Development Committee for international dispute resolution, which drafted a directive to create two bodies: the Intergovernmental Arbitration Committee, which would be composed of members elected by the Intermicronational Senate and would handle minor or civil issues; and the Supreme Court of the Intermicronational Association, which would contain an appointed judge and a jury selected by sortition from the Assembly, and which would handle more serious cases and appeals from the Arbitration Committee. The

bureaucratic details of the two bodies would be established by the DC through the directive and scrutinised by the Senate.

The second example is consistent trading and economic standards. This is a broad field, so let's focus on a single example: exchange rates. This is a complicated field which requires an understanding of, and an interest in, micronational economics. It's appropriate for general discussion in the Collaborate Assembly, but ultimately would require a specialist body, perhaps the Intermicronational Currencies Board, which would be structurally conceived by a DC and would be created formally by the Senate. Listening to discussion in the Assembly, the hypothetical Board would explain how it calculates exchange rates between different nations and would publish the information based on currencies of member states of the IA. It would also then have legal powers to force micronational governments to pass an act that requires them to truthfully express the value of their currency and, when converting into it, offer the correct amount. Any nation that refused to do so would be barred from the exchange rates programme and could face further sanctions, such as the removal of its full member status.

A third example of an area where the IA would be useful would be in creating unified statements on behalf of its member states, and by extension, the IC itself. A powerful symbol of the IC's maturity and unity in the face of contention was seen during the dispute that would lead to the end of its association with MicroWiki: the joint statement issued by Karthia-Ruthenia, the NAC, Delvera and Glastieve. Understanding the views of the IC as a whole, which could be done by the IA through a Polling Board, is important externally as well. A resolution passed by the senate on a seminal issue is a powerful thing: it shows the community standing united as one, and fundamentally, supporting the IC's core and founding principles of unity and equality through respect.

Section 2: How will the IA be structured?

Overview of the IA's structure at formation

The IA is composed of three main bodies, which collectively make up the primary decision-making machine of the organisation: the Collaborate Assembly (the Assembly), the Intermicronational Senate (the Senate) and a series of Development Committees. In addition to these primary structures, the IA will also encompass a

number of smaller organisations created by directive, for example the 'Intermicronational Polling Board' or the 'Intergovernmental Arbitration Committee.'

The organisation's power to execute its decisions derives from treaties signed by any country ascending to the IA. Once a nation joins the IA as a full member state, it must sign a treaty that essentially affirms that the state must implement any directives passed by the Senate as domestic law or be liable to face sanctions against its economy. A second form of membership, associate membership, would also exist. These countries would be allowed to pick-and-choose which aspects of IA law they chose to implement, but would only be allowed to participate with the project in areas where they applied IA directives as law. Partial members would also not be entitled to vote on directives.

Let's look briefly at the three parts of the IA's primary decision-making machine.

The Collaborate Assembly is the least formalised of the three bodies. It's not so much a legislative organ as a discussion and work group, and it does not have the power to pass directives. However, it can create Development Committees, and the Senate is expected to take into account the 'feeling of the floor' in the Assembly when discussing directives. Any member of the IC, or of the MCW or any other community, can be a member of the Assembly. As little voting takes place, it is not a problem for there to be several people from the same country. The Assembly's role in the IA's decision-making process is not its key function, but it has the capacity to create DCs, which can have anyone interested as a member.

Development Committees are the bulwark of the IA's legal process. Although they have no constitutional powers *per se*, DCs play a vital function in creating legislation. Although the Assembly should lay out the basic policy, the DC is responsible for codifying this into a draft law, which should be detailed and formal. This might include the intricacies of the enforcement of a law or the structure of an agency, or any other business that is not appropriate or is too cumbersome to be efficiently discussed in the Assembly.

The Intermicronational Senate is the most powerful of the three institutions. Motions, resolutions or directives drafted by DCs (or, in cases where the wording is appropriately more general or less detailed, by the Assembly) are proposed and voted on by representatives from each member state. Every member state is entitled to send two representatives to the Senate, but these must be elected in a specific manner laid out in the Charter. These representatives, which may be

organised into political parties or blocs, may also propose their own motions, resolutions or directives created by their parties or governments.

In summary, covering only how the bodies interact with each other to create law, the Assembly discusses general ideas for motions and creates DCs; DCs create acts that cover the minutiae of the function of bureaucratic institutions or cover the specific details of the enforcement of a law; and the Senate scrutinises and votes on directives (or motions) created by DCs.

In addition to the primary decision-making bodies of the IA, the following bureaucratic institutions will already exist at the organisation's creation:-

- Ministerial Committee (MC): The MC is a group of either heads of state or foreign ministers of the IA's member states. It meets once every six months to discuss how the IA is perceived and what its role is within their nations.
- General Council (the Council): The Council is elected once a year by the Senate and is composed of IA ministers responsible for overseeing DCs and the enforcement of policy in a given area, i.e. 'Minister for Trade, Economics and Intermicronational Standards.' The *primus inter pares* minister of the Council is elected by the Council and is known as the Prime Minister.
- Standing Orders Committee (SOC): SOC is responsible for organising and chairing formal meetings of other bodies through the enforcement of Standing orders. Elected once every four years by the Senate.
- Ravensgate (not abbreviated): manages and directs the IA's internal and external communications, including briefing employees, conveying formal messages, serving as the representative of the IA to the media and in political affairs, and any other relevant activities. Appointed by the Minister for Communications and Press Strategy.
- Intergovernmental Arbitration Committee (AC): handles minor or civil disputes between governments based on a reading of the appropriate national and international laws. Justices appointed by the Minister for International Justice (in the Council).
- Tribunal for the Intermicronational Association (AT or TftIA): holds officers and agencies of the IA legally accountable
- Supreme Court of the Intermicronational Association (SC): handles appeals from the highest courts of member states and from the AC and AT. Judge appointed by the Minister for International Justice (in the Council) and jury composed of members randomly selected from the Assembly.

(More detailed information will be added here as the treaty is drafted. Watch this space!)